

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 223

SP 022 108

AUTHOR DeBruin, Jerome E.
TITLE A Developmental Perspective on the Growth of Student Teachers Using the COKER and TPAI.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Orlando, FL, January 29-February 3, 1983).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Observation Techniques; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Higher Education; *Lesson Observation Criteria; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teachers; Student Teacher Supervisors; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *COKER (Instrument); *Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument; University of Toledo OH

ABSTRACT

Two student teacher evaluation methods used by the University of Toledo are the Classroom Observation Keyed for Effectiveness Research Instrument (COKER) and the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI). The COKER is an objectively administered low inference system for recording teacher and student interactions in the classroom. (The form itself is replicated in the paper.) Section A of the COKER shows a matrix of numbered cells that designate specific teacher and student interactions. There are three major categories of teacher behaviors in this section: presenting, questioning, and responding. These categories are further subdivided into 37 subcategories. Section B of the COKER features a record of student and teacher behaviors. In contrast to the COKER system, the TPAI is a high inference system that determines how well teachers can demonstrate selected general teaching skills and activities. The instrument contains five sub-instruments: (1) Teaching Plans and Materials; (2) Classroom Procedures; (3) Interpersonal Skills; (4) Professional Standards; and (5) Student Perceptions. The instrument is scored by determining the number of descriptors present for each teaching skill or behavior. Following descriptions of the evaluation methods, 15 suggestions and observations about the methods are offered, based on 4 years of use of the COKER and TPAI. (JM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Jerome E. DeBruin
College of Education and
Allied Professions
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

A Paper Entitled "A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE GROWTH OF STUDENT
TEACHERS USING THE COKER AND TPAI" to be presented at the
Association for Teacher Education (ATE) National Meeting,
Orlando, Florida, January 29-February 3, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jerome E. DeBruin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED228223

SP 022 108

Jerome E. DeBruin
College of Education and
Allied Professions
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606

A Paper Entitled "A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE GROWTH OF STUDENT
TEACHERS USING THE COKER AND TPAI" to be presented at the
Association for Teacher Education (ATE) National Meeting,
Orlando, Florida, January 29-February 2, 1983

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) to present a brief overview of the Classroom Observation Keyed for Effectiveness Research Instrument (COKER), formerly called the GATE, and the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) and to describe how these are used in the classroom to evaluate the effectiveness of student teachers, and (2) to make some candid remarks about four year's experience using these instruments, at The University of Toledo. (My remarks for this presentation will cover those made on pages 5-8 of this paper.) The major advantage in the use of both instruments is that the process affords an opportunity to collect data on student teachers. Use of both instruments also increases both the amount and the quality of supervisory time spent with student teachers and supplies feedback which is necessary to ensure continued personal and professional growth on the part of student teachers. Use of the COKER and TPAI also strengthens existing relationships with personnel in local schools. University professors who act as data collectors and observers are welcome in local schools. This is not always the case as some teacher educators may well know.

Coker Instrument

The COKER instrument is an objectively administered low inference system for recording teacher and student interactions in the classroom. The instrument has Side A and Side B, both of which are depicted in (Dickson, 1980, 1982) and reproduced below.

The Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research Instrument

Section A

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Page	District	School	Teacher	Class Size	
Person	Day	Year	Recorder	Grade	Subject
					Visit

CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS KEYED FOR EFFECTIVENESS RESEARCH 1978		1-2 MOC up	1-3 MOC up	1-4 MOC up	1-5 MOC up	1-6 MOC up	1-7 MOC up	1-8 MOC up	1-9 MOC up	1-10 MOC up	1-11 MOC up	1-12 MOC up
SECTION A		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
PRESENTING	11. Questioning											
	12. Monitors / Prep. student (ent. instruction)											
	13. Directs learning related											
	14. Directs non learning related											
	15. Explains discussion item											
	16. Discusses											
	17. Probes											
QUESTIONING	18. Open-ended / No wrong answer											
	19. Recall / rote / information											
	20. Use of Application											
	21. Sample / Eval / Elaborate - Students own ideas											
	22. Sample / Eval / Elaborate - Other Students ideas											
	23. Reveal											
	24. Probes on explanation											
RESPONDING	25. Probes on student explanation											
	26. Tells gives info											
	27. Wrong answer / No answer / Gives info											
	28. Aspects: neutral / checks own perception											
	29. Uses, attends											
	30. Waits (long)											
	31. Following / Cueing											
	32. Asks another student											
	33. Requests after feedback											
	34. Listens / Observes / Pays attention											
	35. Supports / Questions / Directs / Ignores											
	36. Interrupts / Respects											
	37. Critiques / Comments											

In Section A of the COKER instrument, one finds a matrix of numbered cells that designate specific teacher and student interactions. There are three major categories of teacher behaviors in this section: Presenting, Questioning and Responding. These categories are further subdivided into 37 sub-categories.

Section B of the COKER instrument does not contain a matrix for recording but does feature a record or occurrence of student and teacher behaviors. Cells 40 through 72 are student behaviors, cells 73 through 154 are teacher behaviors.

The Classroom Observations Keyed for Effectiveness Research Instrument

Section B

SECTION B STUDENT		TEACHER	
		METHODOLOGY	AFFECT NON VERBAL CONTROL
60. Enthusiasm		73. Intense Interest	106 Warm, calm
61. Frustration		74. Intense Focus	107 Mod. calm
62. Pos. / Neg. Personality		75. Relaxed	108 Tense / Pat. / Mod.
63. L. / R. smiles		76. S. / M. smile	109 Eye contact
64. Shows pride		77. S. / M. choice	110 Eye contact
65. Agrees, V. or NV		78. S. / M. choice	111 S. / M. choice
66. Friendly, V. or NV		79. Agree, detached	112 Gesture - S. / M. / Pat.
67. Moves / Stares / Forgets V. or NV		80. Observes, Monitor	113 Stares / Head / etc.
68. Code Intervention (60-67)		81. Act, X's	114 Talking / something
69. Intense involvement		82. Monitors, Act	115 Stares / something
70. Leadership		83. Close, active	116 Head / something
71. Follows Routine W/O Rem		84. T. / O. Prob.	117 Head / something
72. S. answers another S.		85. S. / O. Prob.	118 Head / something
73. Works on goal		86. Test, etc. / etc.	119 Head / something
74. Called work / day		87. Multi-task	120 Head / something
75. Compet. / ability		88. S. / M. / M. / M.	121 Head / something
76. Confused		89. Ind. / M. / M. / M.	122 Head / something
77. Self-directed, Ingroup		90. S. / M. / M. / M.	123 Head / something
78. Random about		91. Disobedient	124 Head / something
79. No. / M. / M. / M.		92. Disobedient	125 Head / something
80. Shows, Neg. / etc.		93. Disobedient	126 Head / something
81. Makes face, frowning		94. Disobedient	127 Head / something
82. Tense		95. Disobedient	128 Head / something
83. Tense		96. Disobedient	129 Head / something
84. Tense		97. Disobedient	130 Head / something
85. Picks at another / Neg. / M. / M.		98. Disobedient	131 Head / something
86. Don't / Com. / B. / C. / C.		99. Disobedient	132 Head / something
87. Don't / Annoy / Interfere		100. Disobedient	133 Head / something
88. Takes / Disrupts / Stamp / Throws		101. Disobedient	134 Head / something
89. On / Disrupts		102. Disobedient	135 Head / something
90. On / M. / M. / M. / M.		103. Disobedient	136 Head / something
91. Code Intervention (81-90)		104. Disobedient	137 Head / something
92. Code Intervention (81-90)		105. Disobedient	138 Head / something

GROUPING (circle dominant mode)			
VT	WOT	SV	WT
141	148	1	150
142	147	2.3	151
143	148	4.5	152
144	148	4.5	153
145	148	4.5	154

SUBJECT KEY:

01 - Music & Art	06 - Science
02 - Lang. Arts	07 - Soc. Stu.
03 - Literature	08 - Planning
04 - Math	09 - Transition
05 - Reading	10 - Other

Joan G. & Homer Coker
P.O. Box 1017
Carrollton, Georgia 30117

When using the COKER instrument at The University of Toledo, an observer visits each student teacher twice per quarter. Each visit is 30-40 minutes in duration. Section A is recorded in the first 5 minutes of observational time. Section B is completed the next 5 minutes. Four sheets (front and back) are completed during each visit. A total of 16 sheets are completed by each team of two observers for each student teacher per quarter in The University of Toledo undergraduate program.

All data are collected by observers trained in the use of the COKER. Observers are paired into five teams, thus forming a total group of 10 COKER observers at the present time.

A reliability check is done on each team of two observers. This check ensures agreement between the two observers. Practice sessions and simulations using video tapes to record and compare behaviors are used. An outside evaluator is employed to establish reliability measures between the five teams themselves. Furthermore, practice sessions with actual student teachers in local schools are used by the teams for observer-developer agreement studies.

Quarterly meetings with observers are held to evaluate all phases of the operation--recording procedures, unclear items on the instrument, manual explanations and suggestions for improvement of both the instrument and manuals themselves.

TPAI Instrument

In contrast to the COKER instrument, the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) is a high inference system that determines how well teachers can demonstrate selected general teaching skills and activities. The instrument contains five sub-instruments (1) The Teaching Plans and Materials Instrument, (2) Classroom Procedures, (3) Interpersonal Skills, (4) Professional Standards and (5) Student Perceptions. The instrument is scored by determining the number of descriptors present for each teaching skill or behavior.

When using the TPAI, each student teacher is visited twice per quarter by an observer who is usually the college Student Teaching Supervisor. In addition to these two observations, the observer conducts two interviews with the student teacher per quarter. All data are collected by observers who are trained in the use of the TPAI. This training is provided by the developer of the instrument from The University of Georgia.

When reflecting on four year's experience using the COKER and TPAI, it can be generally said that both instruments are useful in the identification of specific student teacher behaviors and skills. For those who wish to use the instruments, it is recommended that a broad developmental view of teacher growth and development be taken. A perspective that focuses on specific behaviors listed on the instruments themselves is an effective starting point but one may miss the entire Gestalt of teacher growth and development if the focus is too narrow. Computerized profiles of student teacher behaviors which can be used for diagnostic purposes are just beginning to surface in The University of Toledo study. These profiles will help teacher educators and their student teachers to further understand teacher growth and development in the future.

Personal experience related to the use of the COKER and TPAI instruments has been an interesting one. It is recommended that those who plan to use the instrument in the future should be cognizant of the following points.

1. Reach consensus on what cells represent what competencies. This consensus should reflect a research effort at a specific university. The problem of provincialism will surface. Generalizability of findings is limited. Also, the dilemma of limiting the number of behaviors and determining what behaviors are related to what competencies will be apparent.

2. Set up definite procedures for working in schools, e.g., alert student teachers, cooperating teachers, and principals that observers will be working in their schools. This has been done at The University of Toledo with the establishment of a committee composed of university and local school personnel. Procedures for facilitating university personnel who work in schools are established cooperatively by this committee. Thus, relationships

based on mutual trust and respect evolve.

3. Select competent observers who can be trained in the use of both the TPAI and COKER instruments. These individuals should be those who have had previous experience in interaction analyses work.

4. Train observers with the use of video tapes, simulations, and actual classroom observations. This will ensure observer-agreement, observer-developer agreement and will enhance inter-rater reliability.

5. Try to keep the same group of observers over a period of time. The number of people per team should also remain the same. New observers need to be trained in the use of both instruments and this takes additional time and effort.

6. Impress upon observers that they will not be able, nor should they be able, to code all behaviors that occur in one observation while using the COKER instrument.

7. Remember to remind observers to make only one check mark per cell on the COKER instrument and be absolutely sure that the behavior has occurred before checking any cell. A great deal is learned by acts of omission as well as commission.

8. Try to develop inter-team reliability measures across teams within the total group of observers itself. In addition, reliability measures between two observers and developers of the instruments must be done.

9. Observers should try to conduct two observations with the same group of students in the same subject matter area per quarter or semester. This is difficult to do as some student teachers may spend one-half of the student teaching term at one location, the other half at another location but an effort should be made to accomodate this point.

10. Tackle the question of low inference - high inference in an open manner being fully aware that two people can observe the same event at the same time in entirely different ways and come up with several interpretations as to what occurred. Only with open communication can observer agreement be improved.

11. Be sure that observers do not develop "psychological set" when they conduct observations. It is quite easy to slip into an anticipatory pattern in recording interactions in the classroom. This practice should be avoided as much as possible.

12. Train observers to physically follow student teachers around while making observations. This will ensure the capability of hearing both student and teacher comments and seeing non-verbal cues. This is a must for any verbal and non-verbal interaction analysis work.

13. Develop follow-up studies of student teachers as first-year teachers.

14. Develop follow-up studies that involve student teachers, first-year teachers, and pupil outcomes.

15. Lastly, it is emphasized that teacher educators should take a broad global, developmental perspective on teacher growth and development over an extended period of time with the analysis of existing student teacher profiles.

After eleven years of personal observation of student teachers at The University of Toledo, this writer feels that effective teachers grow through various developmental stages or layers similar to those of an onion (2, 3, 4): first egocentricity, concern for specified selected texts, materials, room arrangements in the outer layer, an emphasis on teaching strategies making up a second layer, setting goals for themselves and their students as the third layer, development of a set of professional beliefs and values as the fourth

layer and the development of a set of a personal beliefs and values as the core of the onion.

What lies beyond the COKER and TPAI is not known. However, Carl Sandburg may well have given insight into the process of teacher growth and development when he said: "Life is like an onion; you peel off one layer at a time, and sometimes you weep." It is assumed that Carl Sandburg defined the term "weep" to include both the joys and frustrations inherent in teacher growth and development and the teacher education profession.

1. Dickson, George E. and William Wiersma. Research and Evaluation: A Concern for Competent, Effective Teachers. Toledo: The Center for Educational Research and Services, 1980.
2. Dickson, George E. and William Wiersma. Research and Evaluation in Teacher Education: Measurement of Teacher Competence. Toledo: The Center for Educational Research and Services, 1982.
3. Spodek, Bernard and Theodore Manolakes. "In Class Teacher Training in Open Education," in Studies in Open Education, eds. Bernard Spodek and Herbert Walberg. New York: Agathon Press, 1975.
4. DeBruin, Jerome E. "Past: Beginning Teachers Speak Out," Journal of Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Vol. 24, No. 5, September-October, 1978.
5. DeBruin, Jerome E. and Gary E. Cooke. "Using the Onion Construct to Individualize Inservice," The Forum in Open Education, The University of Georgia, Vol. 5, No. 7, March, 1978.